



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,435	10/31/2001	Min Zhu	M-11960 US	2352
7590	01/31/2005		EXAMINER	DIVECHA, KAMAL B
PHILIP W. WOO SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP 555 CALIFORNIA STREET SUITE 5000 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104-1715			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	
DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/001,435	ZHU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/31/2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 10/31/2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20011031</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

The IDS filed on 10/31/2001 has been considered.

**Drawings**

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the limitations disclosed in claims 2-10 and 12-20 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Regarding claim 5 and 15, the limitations disclosed in the body of the claim does not provide a clear indication of the claim. For example: step 1 states: “accessing a stored telephone number”: the applicant does not disclose in the claim where the telephone number would have been accessed from; step 3 states: “receiving a numeric identification code”: the applicant fails to teach or show the destination and the recipient of the numeric identification code.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

Art Unit: 2151

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U. S. Patent No. 6,085,324).

As per claim 1, Slaughter discloses A method comprising: receiving a request (read as an attempt to gain access to the network by entering a user identification string) to access a target computer (read as a computer on a network) from a remote computer (fig. 1 item #12) at a central computer system (read as central remote access server, fig. 1 item #28) (col. 3 L19-25 and L50-52; fig. 3 item #56); determining whether the remote computer has permission to access the target computer (read as authentication process, col. 3 L52-55; fig. 3 item #57); and allowing the remote computer to access the target computer if the remote computer has permission to access (read as remote user is authenticated to access network) the target computer (read as a computer on a network, col. 3 L56-60; fig. 3 item #58), however, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose the structure of the claimed subject matter which includes a remote computer, a central computer system and a target computer.

Ogram, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the structure of the claimed invention comprising a remote computer (fig. 1 item #11A), an access computer (read as central

Art Unit: 2151

computer system, fig. 1 item #11B) and a linked and a data computer (read as target computer, fig. 1 item #11C and #11D).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ogram as stated above with the remote access system of Slaughter in order to use the structure including a remote computer, central access system and a target computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have provided a regulatory and secure control of information, applications and/or resources transmission over networks of computers (Ogram, col. 1 L12-30) through a central agency that controls the access privileges of the remote computers and/or users.

As per claim 3, Slaughter discloses the method wherein a remote computer is first authenticated, allowed access to network and authorized access to specific network services available on a server if the remote computer has permission to access the network computer and/or services (read as allowing a remote computer to access only some of the applications available on a target computer or server, fig. 3 step #57, 58 and 64).

As per claim 4, Slaughter in view of Ogram does not explicitly disclose the step of receiving a request to establish a connection from the target computer at the central computer system, however, Ogram discloses the process where the connection is made between a data computer (read as target computer) and an access computer (read as central computer system) (fig. 1 item #13A); and connection is made between an access computer and a link computer (fig. 1 item #13B). Therefore, It would have been obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art, that

prior of establishing the connection, there was a request first made by one computer system and request received by another to establish a connection between them. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have provided end-to-end connectivity for reliable data transfers by establishing a connection after receiving a request.

As per claim 6, Slaughter discloses the method allowing a remote computer (fig. 1 item #12) to access the network services (read as accessing applications available on a computer on a network, fig. 3 item #64), however, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose the method where the remote computer is participating in a data conference. Ogram, from the same field of endeavor, discloses the method where the information is flowed from data computer to remote computer and vice versa (read as send and receive process; and read send and receive as data conferencing; fig. 1 and col. 6 L11-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ogram as stated above with the system and method of Slaughter in order to allow a remote computer to access an application and allow the remote computer to engage in data conferencing. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because doing so would have allowed a computer systems to access, transmit, receive and present information and/or applications to other computer system.

As per claim 7, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose the process of allowing the remote computer to transfer a file from the target computer to the remote computer. Ogram, from the same field of endeavor, discloses the process where remote computer is seeking data from data computer (read as target computer), a connection is made between access computer and the data computer permitting information to flow (read as transfer a file) from data computer to remote

computer (col. 6 L19-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ogram as stated above with the remote access system of Slaughter in order to allow a remote computer to transfer a file from a target computer to the remote computer. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have enabled remote users to access information or applications and work from different locations (like work from home) in situations like bad weather, troubleshooting computer systems without physically traveling to the site, etc.

As per claim 10, Slaughter does not explicitly disclose the method wherein the target computer stores a username and password and the target computer uses the username and password to establish a connection with the central computer system. Ogram, from the same field of endeavor, explicitly discloses the method wherein the data computer (read as target computer) stores the IP address of the remote user (read as username) and password into the memory and uses this information to establish a connection with the access system (read as central computer system, col. 7 L9-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Ogram as stated above with the remote access system of Slaughter in order to store the username and password and use this information to establish a connection with the central computer system. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have created a secure communication link between the two computer system and provided data and/or information securely to each other by granting access to authorized users and denying access to unauthorized users.

As per claim 11, It is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1 above and with respect to Ogram's computer system including one or more computers (fig. 1 item #11A, #11B, #11C, #11D).

As per claims 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20, they do not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11. Therefore, claims 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11.

5. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U. S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of Crawford (U. S. Patent No. 5,771,354).

As per claim 2, Slaughter in view of Ogram does not explicitly disclose the method as in claim 1 further comprising allowing the remote computer to access all of the applications that are located on the target computer if the remote computer has permission to access the target computer. Crawford, from the same field of endeavor, teaches the technique, which allows one personal computer to remotely access (read as remote computer) another personal computer and/or resources (read as applications) connected to the other personal computer and Crawford further discloses software that allows remote computer to access all resources that the master computer can access (col. 2 L35-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Crawford as stated above with the remote access system of Slaughter and Ogram in order to allow remote computers and users to access all of the applications located on the target computer. One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have

enabled remote users to access the resources and complete tasks from different locations without being traveling to the physical site.

As per claim 12, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 2. Therefore, claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 2.

6. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U. S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of Shaffer et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,145,083).

As per claim 5, Slaughter in view of Ogram discloses the process where remote user causes remote computer to dial-in from a remote computer over the telephone lines (read as dialing a telephone number, Ogram, col. 6 L38-41) and receiving dial-in information (read as receiving a numeric identification code, Ogram, col. 6 L36-38) or the remote access server receives the user ID string (read as numeric identification code) from communication port (Ogram, col. 6 L44-46), however, Slaughter and Ogram does not explicitly disclose the process including accessing a telephone number; comparing the numeric identification code to a stored numeric identification code; and allowing the remote computer to access the target computer if the received numeric identification code matches the stored identification code.

Shaffer et al., from the same field of endeavor, discloses the process where the caller identification information is detected (read as accessing a stored telephone number, col. 5 L5-12); comparing the incoming caller identification information with predetermined caller identification information (fig. 4 step #102); and initiating connectivity if the incoming caller identification information matches the predetermined caller identification information (read as

allowing access if a match is found, fig. 4 step #80 and step #104). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Shaffer with the remote access system of Slaughter and Ogram for the purpose of using the dial up connection.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have allowed remote users (users or employees who stays at home and conducts business) to establish connectivity for accessing the network services provided at the traditional worksite over analog or digital telephone lines or in other words it would enabled remote access and remote networking (Slaughter, col. 1 L25-35).

As per claim 15, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 5. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 5.

7. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U. S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of "Official Notice".

As per claim 8, Slaughter in view of Ogram does not explicitly disclose the process where the remote computer is allowed to print a file that is associated with an application located on the target computer on a local printer without requiring a local printer driver to be installed on the target computer, however, local printing is obvious and well known in the art. Also, it is known in the art that even though if the printer driver is not installed, the target computer does not require a local printer driver to be installed on the target computer for printing it locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of Ogram in order to allow a remote computer

to print a file located on a target computer on a local printer without requiring a local printer driver to be installed on the target computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because printing a file remotely does not require a local printer driver to be installed in the target computer because local printers are installed with the right drivers for printing documents locally.

As per claim 18, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 8. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 8.

8. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Slaughter, III et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Ogram (U. S. Patent No. 6,085,324), and further in view of Bates et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,184,886 B1).

As per claim 9, Slaughter in view of Ogram does not explicitly disclose the method wherein the target computer (any computer) stores a URL that identifies the central computer system and the target computer uses the URL to establish a connection with the central computer system.

Bates et al., explicitly discloses the method for staging bookmarks (storing or saving URLs that identifies network sites) which comprises a function for adding a bookmark (read as storing a URL that identifies a network site, col. 2 L13-27) and where the user can easily navigate back to any bookmarked site (read as the step of using a URL to establish a connection to a computer system, col. 2 L13-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bates

with the remote access system of Slaughter and Ogram in order to store URL that identifies the computer system site and using URL to establish a connection with that site.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because this would have enabled easy navigation of the valuable information provided by the URL site by simply clicking on the appropriate bookmark (URL) listed in the bookmark menu and establishing a connection with the site (Bates, col. 2L13-47).

As per claim 19, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claim 9. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 9.

**Additional References**

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - a. Domenikos et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,838,910.
  - b. Rosenblatt et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,263,363 B1.

**Conclusion**

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on 9.00am-5.30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ZARNI MAUNG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER